

Salmon and Miller/Walker Basin Planning Effort Project Management Team Meeting

Date: August 29, 2002

Time: 8:30AM – 10:15AM

Location: City of Burien Public Works Offices

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Steve Clark	City of Burien	206-248-5514
Dan Bath	City of Burien	206-439-3154
Don Monaghan	City of SeaTac	206-439-4716
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	206-436-4741
Tom Hubbard	Port of Seattle	206-248-7135
Carol Hunter	WSDOT	206-464-1219
Curt Crawford	King County	206-296-8329
Louise Kulzer	King County	206-296-1980
Julie Cairn	King County	206-296-8032

Introductions

Meeting participants introduced themselves and mentioned other projects that they were working on in addition to the Miller/Walker and Salmon basin projects. There were a few new participants present, and some shifts in responsibilities for existing participants.

General Project Announcements and Discussion

Inter Local Agreement (ILA) Status at King County – PMT members may receive phone calls from Julia Patterson regarding the project. The ILA has been assigned to the Utilities committee and we hope it will be on the Agenda for September. Note: Julia Patterson represents a portion of the basin, but she is not on the committee that it has been assigned to. This could cause some additional delays in passage.

Modeling Plan – King County staff are performing the modeling, with oversight from Ralph Nelson, now with RW Beck. King county staff have prepared a modeling plan which Ralph has reviewed. The plan is available for PMT review for those interested.

The modeling being conducted for the Miller, Walker, and Salmon basins are HSPF models. This is consistent with the type of modeling conducted for the Des Moines Creek Basin Plan.

Meeting overview and ground rules

The agenda for the meeting was reviewed.

The Ground Rules handout was reviewed and discussed.

A few edits to the Ground Rules were discussed and agreed upon:

1. One PMT member recalled that the ILA had language pertaining to decision-making, and that it is to be by consensus.
2. Other members suggested that the decision-making procedures used on the Des Moines Basin Plan should be consulted, because they reflect a successful effort.
3. The group wanted to clarify that this plan is a technical plan, and that decision-making should be driven based on technical merits, not based on political motives. Several members acknowledged that this could sometimes be a difficult distinction to maintain, but that it should be the goal.

Julie also handed out an information sheet she received from Louise about working effectively in groups. The handout was called “Functions That Help Groups”.

Review overall project goals

The project goals that the PMT came up with previously were reviewed, to provide context for follow on topics.

Goal translation

Louise introduced the “Goal Translation” hand out as the more specific tasks the technical team has identified they need to do to accomplish the overall project goals set by the PMT.

This handout was discussed. There were a few minor edits made as a result of the discussion. The clause “over time” is being removed from items 4 and 5. The intent of this revision is to acknowledge that some projects may have immediate benefits. We don’t always need or want to wait until after redevelopment to see the benefits.

Review and discuss PMT related tasks on the Gantt chart

Louise will send another copy of the PMT Gantt chart to Tom Hubbard.

Louise pointed out the more detailed Gantt chart before focusing on the PMT specific Gantt chart.

Discussion items:

There is no existing hydrological model for the Salmon basin

Much of the Miller basin is already modeled, although there is some additional work to be done.

The CH2M Hill report for the Burien 142nd Street Depression is complete, and available. The Hermes Mayfair work is ongoing, though, until about November. Doug Chin (King County) should contact Dan Bath (Burien) to get a copy of the 42nd St. Depression Report, and to discuss preliminary assumptions to be made for Hermes, and discuss how to represent this area in the model.

As noted earlier, King County staff have completed the Modeling Plan, and Ralph Nelson has reviewed it. A contract has been executed between King County and RW Beck for Ralph Nelson's oversight support of the modeling.

King County staff that are working on Salmon basin are also working on Miller/Walker basins (except geotechnical staff).

The convened PMT is for the Salmon and Miller/Walker basin planning efforts. PMT members acknowledged that they might defer to impacted partners if they do not have a direct interest in one of the basins.

The Conditions Report for Salmon is scheduled to be prepared by the end of December 2002 and for Miller/Walker by the end of January 2003. The technical team will draft initial problem prioritization criteria, for the PMT to provide input on.

Schedule: We are pretty much on schedule at this time. However some of the ecological assessment work will probably be delayed because of staffing changes and differences approaches to accomplish this work (accessing critical reaches only, or performing a more extensive assessment). Access issues are also hampering progress on this task. Steve and Dan expressed a strong interest in helping KC gain permission to access the streams for this work. All PMT members were sensitive to not wanting to jeopardize the project and ongoing tense relationships with certain property owners or jurisdictions, in order to gain rights of entry. Louise will provide information to Steve regarding areas we could use assistance on gaining access. Burien has ongoing stream access for fish monitoring efforts.

It was brought up that the City of Normandy Park owns property along the streams in SeaTac and Burien. However, on rechecking City boundaries, most of these parcels are really within the boundaries of Normandy Park rather than Burien. However, because this is public property, it might provide some easier avenues of access. In the past, the Normandy Park Community Club has verbally granted access to their property for assessment purposes. In the past, this group has not remained consistent with their support over time, so we should take advantage of it when we have it.

Budget Expenditures (year to date and anticipated year end)

These two budget reports were reviewed.

Billing timing was discussed. Several partners stressed that billings for fourth quarter need to be submitted no later than the end of January.

Louise stated that there would be a fourth quarter billing. A third quarter billing depends on the timing of the ILA execution by the King County Council.

Billings will be based on actual expenditures. There may be some flexibility in when and how the offsets are applied to the billing. Some partners expressed better budget certainty in 2002 than in 2003.

Build out Conditions for Salmon basin

The PMT reviewed a DRAFT definition of build out assumptions for the basin planning efforts. The modelers need these assumptions to run the model.

There was discussion on the Draft language presented. There are a number of other local considerations that could be included and several clarifications of presented context. Louise will be working on incorporating the feedback from the group on this element, with the overall goal of reaching consensus on this definition by the middle of September, so she can pass it along to the modelers. If she is not able to accomplish this through email and phone discussions ahead of the September 19th meeting, it will be completed at that meeting.

Success Criteria

PMT members were asked to think about how they would assess whether this basin planning effort is successful. They were asked to come to the next meeting with these ideas, so we can establish some success criteria for the project.

Defining “Regional”

King County technical staff would like input from the PMT on the definition of “regional”.

The Basin Plan Goal identifies the assessment of problems and recommendation of solutions to the highest priority problems of “regional” importance.

Louise brought a Draft definition for the group to discuss.

There were a few comments on the draft definition and some hesitance to adopt it as written at the meeting without further thinking about it and it’s specific wording.

During the discussion, it was suggested that the Des Moines Creek Basin Plan had addresses this issue (local vs. regional) and that we should look at that language because it had worked.

After the meeting, King County staff looked at the Des Moines Creek Basin Plan definition. The two definitions are quite similar. The Des Moines Creek definition is more general in scope, however.

As a follow up to the meeting, the Project Manager proposes to adopt the Des Moines Creek definitions of regional and local in place of the definition discussed at the meeting.

They are:

Regional problems are generally those that involve more than one jurisdiction or which impact the overall health of the stream.

Local problems are those that impact only one jurisdiction and only a small isolated portion of the watershed. Local problems also have relatively minor environmental impacts when viewed on a watershed scale, and are not expected to impact the overall health of the creek's aquatic ecosystem.

From Section 3.8 Problem Prioritization (p. 3-35)

Drainage map

Tom offered that there might be drainage information from the west side of the airport to add to the drainage map. The format of the map is Arcview. He'll check to see what the Port has available.

Next Meetings

A schedule of regular meetings was set up for the next several months. With the exception of September 2002 and January 2003, these meetings have been set for the **first Thursday of each month from 9AM – 11AM**. The location is the City of Burien Public Works office. Some meeting locations may need to be changed to address meeting space conflicts or to provide additional space for presentations.

If there is not specific content that needs to be covered at a particular PMT meeting, the Project Manager may cancel the meeting after consulting with the group via email to ensure there are not other outstanding issues to be addressed.

The upcoming PMT meeting dates are:

Thursday September 19, 2002

Thursday October 3, 2002

Thursday November 7, 2002

Thursday December 5, 2002

Thursday January 9, 2003 (this is the 2nd Thursday instead of the 1st Thursday)

Thursday February 6, 2003

Thursday March 6, 2003

All meetings are from 9AM – 11AM at the City of Burien Public Works Office (unless the meeting content requires a larger meeting space)

PLEASE PUT THESE DATES ON YOUR CALENDARS

Upcoming Topics for Discussion and Decision

As noted above, Louise will be working to get agreement on the build out scenarios for the Salmon basin via email and phone discussions, following up on feedback provided at the August 29, 2002 meeting. The modeling staff need this information to be agreed upon by the PMT before they run the build out condition.

September 19th Meeting Items

Finish defining Salmon basin build out conditions if Louise was not able to complete this ahead of the meeting.

Discuss and develop Success Criteria for the overall project.

Review and discuss the Salmon Basin Key Problems as identified by King County staff.

October 3rd Meeting Items

Continue to review and discuss the Salmon Basin Key Problems as identified by King County staff (if this was not completed at September 19th meeting).

Other items from PMT members?

Revised Meeting Handouts (double click to open file)

Updated Contact Information for PMT and project staff	082902PMTAtt01.pdf
Revised Ground Rules	082902PMTAtt02.pdf
Revised Goal Translation	082902PMTAtt03.pdf
Revised Definition of “Regional”	082902PMTAtt04.pdf

Miller/Salmon Creek Basin Planning Effort

Contact information (updated 8/29/02)

Name	Organization	Phone	Email
Steve Clark	City of Burien	206, 248-5514	stephenc@ci.burien.wa.us
Dan Bath	City of Burien	206, 439-3154	danb@ci.burien.wa.us
Don Monaghan	City of SeaTac	206, 439-4716	donald@seatac.wa.gov
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	206, 241-1996	dales@seatac.wa.gov
Curt Crawford	King County Management team	206, 296-8329	curt.crawford@metrokc.gov
Tom Hubbard	Port of Seattle	206, 248-7135	hubbard.t@portseattle.org
Carol Hunter	WSDOT	206, 464-1219	hunterc@wsdot.wa.gov
Louise Kulzer	King County, project manager	206, 296-1980	louise.kulzer@metrokc.gov
Julie Cairn	Facilitator	206, 296-8032	julie.cairn@metrokc.gov
Doug Chin	King County, project engineer	206, 296-8315	doug.chin@metrokc.gov

Burien Public Works Conference Room: 457 SW 148th St, Suite 201

Mailing addresses:

Carol Hunter
401 2nd Ave South #580
Seattle, WA 98104-2448
(206) 464-1219

Stephen Clark
Public Works Director

City of Burien
415 SW 150th
Burien WA 98166

Don Monaghan
Public Works Director
City of SeaTac
17900 International Blvd Suite 401
SeaTac 98188

Tom Hubbard
Port of Seattle
17900 International Boulevard, Suite 301
SeaTac, WA 98188-4980

Miller and Salmon Basin Planning Projects

Project Management Team (PMT)

Revised following August 29, 2002 PMT Meeting

Ground Rules

1. Create an environment where all input and viewpoints are listened to and respected, even if you don't agree.
2. Allow the speaker to finish his or her thoughts without interrupting.
3. Don't monopolize the discussion.
4. Provide feedback and be willing to share perspectives - both yours and your organizations.
5. NO HIDDEN AGENDAS!
6. Bring issues or concerns to the Project Manager early, rather than letting them linger.
7. During meetings, use a "parking lot" for items that are not immediately relevant, but that we don't want to forget about later.
8. Start and end on time (It's OK to start when 4 of the 5 PMT members are present).
9. Decision making - ~~determine how the group will make decisions in advance~~ - [Section IV.C of the ILA states "The PMT will reach its decisions by consensus. Issues that cannot be resolved by the PMT will be referred for resolution to the appointing authorities for the PMT, as identified in Section IV.B. of this Agreement."](#)
10. [Because this is a technical plan, decision-making should be driven based on technical merits, not based on political motives.](#)

Miller/Walker & Salmon Creek Basin Plan – Goal Translation

(What we need to do, as the project team sees it)

Revised after 082902 PMT Meeting

1. Determine the key infrastructure, WQ & stream problems in the three watersheds
2. Determine target non-erosive flows for the three streams
3. Make a model for each of the streams (Salmon, Miller & Walker)
 - a) to see how much capital improvement (detention storage, by-pass, etc.) is needed to achieve target non-erosive flows
 - b) to see how infrastructure problems will change in future
4. Develop infrastructure and redevelopment alternatives to achieve target non-erosive stream flows (set the stage for habitat improvements) and fix selected regional problems
5. Identify what stream habitat improvements could be pursued in the short term as the non-erosive flow alternative is being incrementally achieved

Miller/Walker & Salmon Planning Effort

Definition of REGIONAL

Revised following the August 29, 2002 PMT Meeting

READY FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION at 09/19/2002 PMT Meeting

Problems are considered regional if:

- ~~they extend over the area of more than one jurisdiction or partners or if significant involvement from the permitting jurisdiction would be needed to implement solutions~~
- ~~they affect other jurisdictions or partners or potential solutions could have effects on other jurisdictions/partners~~
- ~~They involve a resource that is of importance to or benefits citizen from more than one jurisdiction/organization~~

Problems are considered local if:

- ~~they are wholly contained within one jurisdiction or need little or perfunctory input from the permitting jurisdiction to implement solutions~~

~~AND~~

AND

- ~~do not have foreseeable detrimental effects on another jurisdiction/partner or preclude options for another jurisdiction's needed future drainage improvements~~

The following, more general language, was excerpted from Section 3.8 of the Des Moines Creek Basin Plan, and is proposed for use in the Miller / Salmon Creek Planning Efforts:

Regional problems are generally those that involve more than one jurisdiction or which impact the overall health of the stream.

Local problems are those that impact only one jurisdiction and only a small isolated portion of the watershed. Local problems also have relatively minor environmental impacts when viewed on a watershed scale, and are not expected to impact the overall health of the creek's aquatic ecosystem.